

**Professional Identity and Status: An Ethnography of Architects in
Professional Service Firms**

A thesis submitted by

Sumati Ahuja

Doctor of Philosophy

UTS Business School, Management Discipline Group

University of Technology Sydney

June 2018

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, Sumati Ahuja, declare that this thesis is submitted in the fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), in the Business School, Management Discipline Group, at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

Professional editor, Genevieve Farrell, provided copyediting and proofreading services, according to the guidelines laid out in the university-endorsed national 'Guidelines for editing research theses'.

This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

Production Note:

Signature: Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 18/6/2018

STATEMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PAPERS CONTAINED IN THE THESIS

The following list summarises Sumati Ahuja's overall contributions to the co-authored papers in this thesis.

Paper	Sumati Ahuja's contribution
<p>Ahuja, S., Heizmann, H. and Clegg, S. (Conditional acceptance, April 2018: under 4th review) 'Emotions and Identity Work: Emotions as discursive resources for the construction of junior architects' identities', <i>Human Relations</i>.</p> <p>Sumati Ahuja:</p> <p>Helena Heizmann:</p> <p>Stewart Clegg:</p>	<p>Overall: 80%</p> <p><i>Sumati Ahuja</i> 16/05/18</p> <p><i>Helena Heizmann</i> 15/05/18</p>
<p>Ahuja, S., Nikolova, N. and Clegg, S. (2017) 'Paradoxical Identity: The Changing Nature of Architectural Work and its Relation to Architects' Identity', <i>Journal of Professions and Organization</i>, vol. 4, no. 1.</p> <p>Sumati Ahuja:</p> <p>Natalia Nikolova:</p> <p>Stewart Clegg:</p>	<p>Overall: 80%</p> <p><i>Sumati Ahuja</i> 16/05/18</p> <p><i>N. Nikolova</i> 15/05/18</p>
<p>Ahuja, S., Nikolova, N. and Clegg, S. (under review; 2nd revise and resubmit) 'Paradox of Professional Identity: Both best for client and best for project', <i>Journal of Professions and Organization</i>.</p> <p>Sumati Ahuja:</p> <p>Natalia Nikolova:</p> <p>Stewart Clegg:</p>	<p>Overall: 80%</p> <p><i>Sumati Ahuja</i> 16/05/18</p> <p><i>N. Nikolova</i> 15/05/18</p>
<p>Ahuja, S. and Nikolova, N. (under review; 1st revise and resubmit) 'No one gets to play God': Negotiating Professional Status in Cross Functional Work Teams, <i>Organization Science</i>.</p> <p>Sumati Ahuja:</p> <p>Natalia Nikolova:</p>	<p>Overall: 80%</p> <p><i>Sumati Ahuja</i> 16/05/18</p> <p><i>N. Nikolova</i> 15/05/18</p>

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	5
PREFACE	6
ABSTRACT.....	7
1. INTRODUCTION	9
1.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	11
1.2 OVERVIEW OF THE PAPERS	16
1.3 OUTLINE OF THE THESIS.....	17
2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	19
2.1 BECOMING.....	23
2.2 DOING	25
2.3 RELATING	28
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN	34
3.1 ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS AS AN EMPIRICAL SETTING	36
3.2 DATA COLLECTION	39
3.3 DATA ANALYSIS	47
4. APPENDED PAPERS.....	51
4.1 EXTENDED ABSTRACT, PAPER 1.....	51
4.2 EXTENDED ABSTRACT, PAPER 2.....	91
4.3 EXTENDED ABSTRACT, PAPER 3.....	134
4.4 EXTENDED ABSTRACT, PAPER 4.....	176
5. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUDING DISCUSSION.....	223
5.1 FUTURE RESEARCH	236
5.2 CONCLUDING REMARKS	240
6. APPENDIX: FIELDWORK DOCUMENTATION	241
6.1 TABLE 1 THE PARTICIPANTS.....	241
6.2 TABLE 2 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS OBSERVED	242
6.3 THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	243
6.3 INFORMATION SHEET.....	244
6.4 CONSENT FORM	245
7. REFERENCES	246

Acknowledgements

A PhD is often described as a journey. Luckily for me there were remarkable people to share my experiences with. My PhD journey has been greatly enriched by the support of my supervisory team. I am grateful to my primary supervisor, Professor Stewart Clegg, for encouraging me to find my voice. I would like to thank Stewart for his support, commitment and constructive feedback that have greatly inspired and guided me on this journey. When we first met, I was unsure if I was seeing the light at the end of tunnel or the light of the train coming at me. In the end, it turns out it was both. Learning to accept the 'both/and' paradox of this journey has, in a way, motivated me to complete this thesis. Stewart, your words of encouragement have meant a lot. Most of all, thank you for introducing me to two amazing women.

Natalia, thank you for your immense contributions. Thank you for seeing the potential in my work. I have greatly relied upon and valued your advice and constructive feedback. It has been a pleasure to develop what I hope will be a lasting friendship.

Helena, you came into this journey a bit later, but your contributions are significant in helping me find a way through the maze that I created. I have enjoyed our lengthy and in-depth discussions. Your encouragement and suggestions have greatly improved my theoretical understandings and communication thereof.

Thank you to the community at EGOS, SWG: Management, Occupations and Professions in Social Context for helping shape the theoretical contributions of the papers that form this thesis. Your encouragement and considered discussions have provided many valuable insights over the years.

I want to acknowledge the many architects who have helped guide my interpretations of what is going on in their world of work. Thank you to all the architects who have supported and encouraged this research from the start. These architects generously allowed me to observe their daily work routines and participated in the formal interviews. I have made many friends in the process, and I hope that many of you will recognize yourselves in the interviews and find that your experiences have been fairly presented. I want to thank the four firms who opened their doors to me. Without the support of the four firms and the candid interviews this research would not have been possible.

A big thanks to my friends and fellow PhD students at MDG, UTS Business School, who have shared the pain and pleasure with me. Veronica, Daphne, Lisa, Mark, Matt and Graeme, thanks for the many chats, lunches and cups of tea over the years that have sustained me throughout.

I am indebted to my family who have supported me personally with their unconditional and unwavering belief in me. My children have been very patient, even though they did not quite understand why mum had to be endlessly locked in her study. As Karan has pointed out to me several times, 'mum, I don't understand what you are doing, but if it makes you happy then I'm happy too!' A special thanks to my Uma for encouraging me to 'keep at it!'

Preface

My research into professionals in organizations was initially inspired by my experiences as a practicing architect and educator. Curious about how to best prepare students for practice and frustrated by the lack of leadership I witnessed in architectural practice, I turned to academia. I wanted to make sense of my own experiences and understand more accurately the tensions confronting contemporary architects in the course of day-to-day work and how they respond to the changing world of work. The study began with broad questions about the meaning and significance of work. My fascination with work as an activity that takes up a great part of our daily lives is tied with the centrality of work to the constitution of the self. Originally, based on personal observations, two things intrigued me: on the one hand, architects were presumed to have rewarding careers and saw themselves as idealists in pursuit of designing for the greater good of society, modeling themselves on the heroic image of globally famous architects – mostly men. On the other hand, architectural work involved several tensions including intense competition for jobs, extremely long hours, demanding clients and crippling regulations, all leading to high levels of work stress. In other words, what I empirically observed was a mismatch between the long-standing heroic self-image of architects akin to the mythical figure of Howard Roark in *The Fountainhead* (Rand 1943) and the near impossibility of ever being able to realize those aspirations. I was particularly struck by how little has changed in the 30 years since Dana Cuff's (1991) seminal study of architectural practice. Students are still hopelessly ill-prepared for the real world of work, and at first glance, architects' offices still resemble those of the 1900s. The only noticeable difference is that computers have replaced the drawing boards. Yet, architects of the 21st century are operating in a transformed landscape of work. Large multidisciplinary design firms are de rigueur. Projects have become so complex that they require the expertise of a myriad of specialists. Clients have become more complex and increasingly influence design on large-scale construction projects. Client organizations demand not just design excellence but considerable financial savvy. Yet, despite these transformative and irreversible changes, the myth of the individual genius endures, and the profession continues to honor the individual-hero architect. Oddly, instead of diving in and shaping the world for the better, the architectural profession appears locked in a crisis of relevance. In light of these enduring contradictions, this research originated from general questions about what working as an architect on large-scale urban renewal projects entails. I started with two broad sociological questions: What do architects do in the actual practice of professional work? What implications does the practice of professional work have on the professionals' self-concepts? I don't claim to have all the answers yet, but this research has been a valuable step in addressing these questions.

Abstract

There is a growing consensus that the nature of professional work is changing. Traditionally, the status conferred by the title ‘professional’ signaled a claim to specialist knowledge such that professionals were trusted advisors who played an important economic and social role (as experts in justice, health and education) in knowledge-intensive societies. However, a range of fundamental changes such as the rise of managerialism, increasingly interdependent work structures and the active involvement of increasingly more-knowledgeable clients, have challenged these assumptions suggesting that professional work faces an uncertain future. In this thesis, I argue that such crucial changes to the landscape of professional work trigger tensions for architects’ identity and status premised on notions of expert authority. I problematize long-held assumptions of professional identity and status by focusing on the interpretations and actions of individuals in their day-to-day work.

This research was designed and constructed from an interpretivist perspective adopting a tension-centered approach in which tensions and paradoxes play a central role in ordering and disordering social reality for organizational members. I use ethnographic methods to shed new light on the discursive processes through which one group of professionals – architects – attempt to make sense of the changes that affect their daily work. In so doing, my thesis links agentic-level activities with tensions generated by changes to the very structure of professional work. My findings suggest that in an era characterized by increasing skepticism of experts and professional expertise, traditional conceptions of professional identity and occupational status require revision. I present my thesis as four distinct journal articles that are linked by the investigation of how architects negotiate professional identity and status as they seek to manage complex tensions, triggered by the changing nature of their work. I conclude that more accurate

understandings of how people employed in complex organizations respond to, cope with and move forward amid paradoxical tensions sheds new light on the construction of work-related identities and status and how this occurs in the new world of work. As the world of work becomes more complex and distributed, these understandings are particularly relevant because they have implications not just for individuals' sense of well-being, but also broader, economic consequences for organizations and society.